

Draft Environmental Assessment

Washoe Park Isolation Facility

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks Project #7153604

August 2015



***Montana Fish,
Wildlife & Parks***

Draft Environmental Assessment MEPA, NEPA, MCA 23-1-110 CHECKLIST

PART I. PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION

1. **Type of proposed state action:** Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (FWP) proposes to construct a new 20'x45' building at the Washoe Park Trout Hatchery in order to ensure the capability of incubating eggs and rearing fry from wild populations of westslope cutthroat and arctic grayling. In addition to the building, FWP will also be building a parking lot and a second driveway attached to Pennsylvania Ave, as well as increasing its input into the city sewer system by up to 100gpm.

2. **Agency authority for the proposed action:** Per state statute (87-3-201 MCA), FWP has full control of all state fish hatcheries and is responsible for their construction, maintenance, and operation. Furthermore, FWP may use fish and game funds necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, upkeep, and repair of fish hatcheries or other property or means and appliances for the protection and propagation of fish, game, and fur-bearing animals, or game or nongame birds (87-1-222 (3) MCA).

3. **Anticipated Schedule:**
 Estimated construction commencement date: Oct 1, 2015
 Estimated completion date: April 1, 2015
 Current status of project design (% complete): 65%

4. **Location affected by proposed action:**
 The Washoe Park Trout Hatchery is located in Anaconda, Montana, directly adjacent to Washoe Park on the west and fronting Pennsylvania Avenue on the south.

5. **Project size - estimate the number of acres that would be directly affected that are currently:**

	<u>Acres</u>		<u>Acres</u>
(a) Developed:		(d) Floodplain	<u>0</u>
Residential	<u>5</u>		
Industrial	<u>0</u>	(e) Productive:	
		Irrigated cropland	<u>0</u>
(b) Open Space/	<u>0</u>	Dry cropland	<u>0</u>
Woodlands/Recreation		Forestry	<u>0</u>
(c) Wetlands/Riparian	<u>0</u>	Rangeland	<u>0</u>
Areas		Other	<u>0</u>

8. **Permits, funding, and overlapping or additional jurisdiction:**
 - (a) **Permits:** Anaconda - Deer Lodge County Building Permit, Driveway Approach Permit

 - (b) **Funding:** Fisheries Mitigation Trust Funds - \$149,000

(c) Other overlapping or additional jurisdictional responsibilities:
State Historic Preservation Office - cultural & historic resources

9. Narrative summary of the proposed action:

Montana FWP does not currently have a large-scale isolation facility within its hatchery system for the rearing of wild-source westslope cutthroat trout and Arctic grayling eggs and fry for conservation projects. Currently, a facility and personnel are held under contract by FWP to complete this necessary work. Building this facility at Washoe Park will allow higher numbers of eggs and fry to be raised for conservation projects by FWP personnel in a convenient and secure location with more flexible access for biologists. Cost to FWP will be substantially lower than the current contract as well.

Existing FWP hatcheries cannot accommodate the growing demands for wild egg and fry rearing capabilities while keeping with biosecurity standards. Additional rearing space is required to meet the growing demand for drainage specific eyed eggs and fry, but it must be contained within a separate building, with effluent drainage to city sewer, in order to ensure the health and genetic integrity of the M012 brood which is also housed at Washoe Park as well as fish populations downstream of the hatchery.

Benefits from this project will include:

- Biosecure rearing space necessary to propagate native species from wild stocks for restoration efforts in their native ranges across Montana.
- Significant reduction in cost of rearing eggs and fry for conservation purposes when compared to the current contract.
- Providing flexibility to biologists and techs for drop off and pick up of eggs and fry, care provided by experienced hatchery staff, secure facility with employees on-sight 24/7.

10. Description and analysis of reasonable alternatives:

Alternative A: Proposed Action

FWP proposed to construct a 20' x 45' building to rear wild eggs and fry for conservation and restoration projects for westslope cutthroat and arctic grayling in southwest Montana.

Anticipated cost of the project is \$149,000, which will be funded by 100% Fisheries Mitigation Trust Funds (verify with Eileen) dollars.

The new isolation building will be maintained with statewide Fish Hatchery Operation and Maintenance funds, and managed by the staff at the Washoe Park Trout Hatchery.

Alternative B: No Action

The building is not built. State needs for restoration programs may be unmet, particularly for native fish and eyed eggs. Under the current contract program, biologists are unable to get the quantity of eggs and fry necessary for projects because of both space and cost limitations.

PART II. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

Evaluation of the impacts of the Proposed Action -

A. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

1. <u>LAND RESOURCES</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Soil instability or changes in geologic substructure?		X				
b. Disruption, displacement, erosion, compaction, moisture loss, or over-covering of soil, which would reduce productivity or fertility?		X				
c. Destruction, covering, or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?		X				
d. Changes in siltation, deposition, or erosion patterns that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed or shore of a lake?		X				
e. Exposure of people or property to earthquakes, landslides, ground failure, or other natural hazard?		X				

2. <u>AIR</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Emission of air pollutants or deterioration of ambient air quality?		X				
b. Creation of objectionable odors?		X				
c. Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature patterns or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?		X				
d. Adverse effects on vegetation, including crops, due to increased emissions of pollutants?		X				
e. <u>For P-R/D-J projects</u> , will the project result in any discharge, which will conflict with federal or state air quality regulations? (Also see 2a.)		X				

There is likely going to be an increase in dust during the construction phase of this project. After construction is complete, dust levels will return to normal. Contractors will follow all permit regulations with regard to air quality and dust control during the construction phase.

3. <u>WATER</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Discharge into surface water or any alteration of surface water quality including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity?		X				
b. Changes in drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface runoff?		X				
c. Alteration of the course or magnitude of floodwater or other flows?		X				
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body or creation of a new water body?		X				
e. Exposure of people or property to water-related hazards such as flooding?		X				
f. Changes in the quality of groundwater?		X				
g. Changes in the quantity of groundwater?		X				
h. Increase in risk of contamination of surface or groundwater?		X				
i. Effects on any existing water right or reservation?		X				
j. Effects on other water users as a result of any alteration in surface or groundwater quality?		X				
k. Effects on other users as a result of any alteration in surface or groundwater quantity?		X				
l. For P-R/D-J, will the project affect a designated floodplain? (Also see 3c.)		X				
m. For P-R/D-J, will the project result in any discharge that will affect federal or state water quality regulations? (Also see 3a.)		X				

The hatchery does lie within the 100-year floodplain, however, the proposed project would have no effect on surface water, drainage patterns, or floodwater routes. As previously noted, disturbed soils will be reseeded with native vegetation, which will decrease the likelihood of new drainage patterns becoming established.

4. VEGETATION Will the proposed action result in?	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Changes in the diversity, productivity, or abundance of plant species (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants)?		X				
b. Alteration of a plant community?		X				
c. Adverse effects on any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species?		X				
d. Reduction in acreage or productivity of any agricultural land?		X				
e. Establishment or spread of noxious weeds?			X		Yes	4a.
f. For P-R/D-J, will the project affect wetlands, or prime and unique farmland?		X				

- 4a. Reseeding disrupted soils after construction will limit the potential for additional weeds by providing competition from a mix of local native vegetation. Noxious weed control efforts will follow the guidelines presented in FWP's 2008 Integrated Noxious Weed Management Plan, which includes the use of herbicides and mechanical efforts

5. <u>FISH/WILDLIFE</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Deterioration of critical fish or wildlife habitat?		X				
b. Changes in the diversity or abundance of game animals or bird species?		X				
c. Changes in the diversity or abundance of nongame species?		X				
d. Introduction of new species into an area?		X				
e. Creation of a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?		X				
f. Adverse effects on any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species?		X				
g. Increase in conditions that stress wildlife populations or limit abundance (including harassment, legal or illegal harvest or other human activity)?		X				
h. ****For P-R/D-J, will the project be performed in any area in which T&E species are present, and will the project affect any T&E species or their habitat? (Also see 5f.)		X				
i. ***For P-R/D-J, will the project introduce or export any species not presently or historically occurring in the receiving location? (Also see 5d.)		X				

B. HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

6. <u>NOISE/ELECTRICAL EFFECTS</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Increases in existing noise levels?			X			
b. Exposure of people to severe or nuisance noise levels?			X			
c. Creation of electrostatic or electromagnetic effects that could be detrimental to human health or property?		X				
d. Interference with radio or television reception and operation?		X				

The initiation of the proposed action would generate a temporary increase in noise level during the construction period. Noise levels are expected to return to preconstruction levels after the building is completed since there would be no change in the level of activity on FWP-owned property.

7. LAND USE Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Alteration of or interference with the productivity or profitability of the existing land use of an area?		X				
b. Conflict with a designated natural area or area of unusual scientific or educational importance?		X				
c. Conflict with any existing land use, the presence of which would constrain or potentially prohibit the proposed action?		X				
d. Adverse effects on or relocation of residences?		X				

The installation of a new building on the hatchery property would not change existing land uses at the site.

8. <u>RISK/HEALTH HAZARDS</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Risk of an explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation) in the event of an accident or other forms of disruption?			X		Yes	8a.
b. Affect an existing emergency response or emergency evacuation plan, or create a need for a new plan?			X			8b.
c. Creation of any human health hazard or potential hazard?		X				
d. For P-R/D-J, will any chemical toxicants be used? (Also see 8a.)		X				

8a. Chemical spraying is part of FWP's weed management plan to limit the infestation of noxious weeds on its properties. Weed treatment and storage and mixing of the chemicals would be in accordance with standard operating procedures.

The contractor would be required to have a plan for implementing appropriate measures in the event of an accidental spill.

8b. Construction of the driveway or connection to city sewer could impact emergency vehicle movement to and from the Anaconda Community Hospital. Contractors will be required to mitigate this issue as per county permitting.

9. <u>COMMUNITY IMPACT</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Alteration of the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?		X				
b. Alteration of the social structure of a community?		X				
c. Alteration of the level or distribution of employment or community or personal income?		X				
d. Changes in industrial or commercial activity?		X				
e. Increased traffic hazards or effects on existing transportation facilities or patterns of movement of people and goods?			X		Yes	9e.

The proposed action will have no effect on local communities or alter the distribution of population in the area.

9e. The movement of heavy equipment merging onto Pennsylvania Avenue may cause some additional traffic congestion during the construction period. The FWP contractors would be required to install appropriate signage along the county road and at the hatchery entrance advising the public of potential traffic hazards. After the construction is completed, traffic patterns are expected to return to normal patterns and levels.

10. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES/TAXES/UTILITIES</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Will the proposed action have an effect upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: fire or police protection, schools, parks/recreational facilities, roads or other public maintenance, water supply, sewer or septic systems, solid waste disposal, health, or other governmental services? If any, specify:				X		10b
b. Will the proposed action have an effect upon the local or state tax base and revenues?		X				
c. Will the proposed action result in a need for new facilities or substantial alterations of any of the following utilities: electric power, natural gas, other fuel supply or distribution systems, or communications?			X			10c.
d. Will the proposed action result in increased use of any energy source?			X			10d.
e. Define projected revenue sources		X				
f. Define projected maintenance costs.						10f.

10b. FWP will be seeking a new connection to ADLC waste water system at a rate of 100gpm. This could be a significant addition to the city's sewer system.

10c/d. The proposed new building will be electrified and will be an additional user of energy at the hatchery.

10f. Maintenance costs will be minimal with metal construction, but will include snow removal, weed abatement and typical building maintenance.

11. <u>AESTHETICS/RECREATION</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Alteration of any scenic vista or creation of an aesthetically offensive site or effect that is open to public view?		X				
b. Alteration of the aesthetic character of a community or neighborhood?			X		Yes	11b.
c. Alteration of the quality or quantity of recreational/tourism opportunities and settings? (Attach Tourism Report.)		X				
d. For P-R/D-J, will any designated or proposed wild or scenic rivers, trails or wilderness areas be impacted? (Also see 11a, 11c.)		X				

11b. In the short term, existing aesthetics at the site would be adversely affected due to temporary ground disturbance and the presence of heavy equipment during construction. Site would be landscaped after

construction is completed. Building color(s) would be earth tones to blend into the rural setting of the hatchery.

12. CULTURAL/HISTORICAL RESOURCES Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Destruction or alteration of any site, structure or object of prehistoric, historic, or paleontological importance?		X				
b. Physical change that would affect unique cultural values?		X				
c. Effects on existing religious or sacred uses of a site or area?		X				
d. For P-R/D-J, will the project affect historic or cultural resources? Attach SHPO letter of clearance. (Also see 12a.)		N/A				

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) was contacted to complete a search of their file for previously identified cultural or historic sites with the hatchery property. There are no sensitive resources present where the proposed action would take place.

13. SUMMARY EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE Will the proposed action, considered as a whole:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project or program may result in impacts on two or more separate resources that create a significant effect when considered together or in total.)		X				
b. Involve potential risks or adverse effects, which are uncertain, but extremely hazardous if they were to occur?		X				
c. Potentially conflict with the substantive requirements of any local, state, or federal law, regulation, standard, or formal plan?		X				
d. Establish a precedent or likelihood that future actions with significant environmental impacts will be proposed?		X				
e. Generate substantial debate or controversy about the nature of the impacts that would be created?		X				
f. For P-R/D-J, is the project expected to have organized opposition or generate substantial public controversy? (Also see 13e.)		N/A				
g. For P-R/D-J, list any federal or state permits required.		N/A				

The proposed addition of a new building at the Washoe Park Trout Hatchery is not expected to generate substantial debate within the community. Cumulative impacts to existing physical and human resources are minimal since the footprint of the new building and associated utility connection would be less than 1 acre and contained within the FWP property and for the reasoning previously described.

Evaluation and listing of mitigation, stipulation, or other control measures enforceable by the agency or another government agency:

The project will be supervised by FWP's Design and Construction Bureau (D&C) and administered by the state Architect and Engineer Bureau of the State Department of Administration.

The FWP D&C engineering staff have designed the proposed site plan following Best Management Practices. A private contractor, required to meet all state standards and specifications, will complete construction of the project. The D&C will oversee the project and will be responsible for final inspection. All state and federal permits will be the responsibility of FWP or the contractor through FWP.

PART III. NARRATIVE EVALUATION AND COMMENT

Existing FWP hatcheries cannot accommodate the growing demands for wild egg and fry rearing capabilities while keeping with biosecurity standards. Additional rearing space is required to meet the growing demand for drainage specific eyed eggs and fry, but it must be contained within a separate building, with effluent drainage to city sewer, in order to ensure the health and genetic integrity of the M012 brood as well as fish populations downstream of the hatchery. Building this facility at Washoe Park will allow higher numbers of eggs and fry to be raised for conservation projects by FWP personnel in a convenient and secure location with more flexible access for biologists. Cost to FWP will be substantially lower than the current contract.

PART IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1. Public involvement:

The public will be notified in the following manners to comment on this current EA, the proposed action, and alternatives:

- Two public notices in each of these papers: Anaconda Leader and Montana Standard
- One statewide press release
- Public notice on the Fish, Wildlife & Parks web page: <http://fwp.mt.gov>

Copies of this environmental assessment will be distributed to the neighboring landowners and interested parties to ensure their knowledge of the proposed project.

This level of public notice and participation is appropriate for a project of this scope, having limited impacts in a very localized area, of which most can be mitigated.

2. Duration of comment period:

The public comment period will extend for (30) thirty days. Written comments will be accepted until 5:00 p.m. September 25, 2015, and can be mailed to Washoe Park

Isolation Project, Washoe Park Trout Hatchery, 600 W Pennsylvania Ave, Anaconda, MT 59711 or Angsmith@mt.gov

PART V. EA PREPARATION

1. **Based on the significance criteria evaluated in this EA, is an EIS required? (YES/NO)?** No

If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is the appropriate level of analysis for this proposed action.

Based upon the above assessment (Part II), which identified a very limited number of minor impacts from the proposed action, of which most can be mitigated below significance, an EIS is not required and an environmental assessment is the appropriate level of review.

2. **Person responsible for preparing the EA:**

Angela Smith
Washoe Park Trout Hatchery Manager
Washoe Park Trout Hatchery
600 W Pennsylvania Ave
Anaconda, MT 59711
406-563-2531

3. **List of agencies or offices consulted during preparation of the EA:**

Anaconda Deer Lodge County
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks
Fisheries Bureau
Montana Historic Preservation Office

APPENDIX

Preliminary Design Plan – Pg. 14

